H7PVOKET UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 1 SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK 2 3 IFEANYICHUKWU E. OKEKE, ET AL, 4 Plaintiffs, 5 16 CV 570 (CM) v. 6 NEW YORK PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL, 7 Defendant. JURY TRIAL 8 9 New York, N.Y. July 25, 2017 10 11:08 a.m. Before: 11 12 HON. COLLEEN MCMAHON, 13 District Judge 14 APPEARANCES 15 OFODILE & ASSOCIATES Attorneys for Plaintiffs 16 BY: ANTHONY C. OFODILE -AND-17 LAW OFFICE OF OSONDU ANYADIKE BY: OSONDU ANYADIKE 18 EPSTEIN BECKER & GREEN 19 Attorneys for Defendant BY: BRIAN G. CESARATTO 20 STUART M. GERSON ANN K. MAHONEY 21 22 23 24 25

1	(Trial resumed; jury not present)
2	(At 11:00 a.m., a note was received from the jury)
3	THE COURT: Case on trial continued. Counsel are
4	present, the jurors are not present at 11 o'clock this morning.
5	The jurors have sent a note. They want: "The
6	transcript from Mr. Mahmoud on 7/17/17."
7	That's his direct; they want Mr. Mahmoud's direct.
8	MR. OFODILE: Okay.
9	THE COURT: It's pages 361 to 416 of the transcript.
10	My proposal is that we copy it and give it to them.
11	MR. GERSON: Why not?
12	MR. OFODILE: Yes, your Honor.
13	THE COURT: There are a few objections in it, who
14	cares; I ruled on them; they know what that means.
15	Let's just do it, okay?
16	MR. GERSON: Agreed.
17	MR. OFODILE: Yes.
18	THE COURT: Done. It's Court Exhibit 4.
19	(Recess pending verdict)
20	(At 12:10 p.m., a note was received from the jury)
21	THE COURT: Case on trial continues. The parties are
22	present, the jurors are not present.
23	At 12:10, Jeremy was handed a note that said: "We,
24	the jury, are filling out the verdict sheet and will be ready
25	at 12:30."

1	(Jury present)
2	THE COURT: Do you guys send color-coded memos?
3	THE JURY: No.
4	THE COURT: It's really uncanny.
5	Have a seated. It's not the first time.
6	Ladies and gentlemen, I have a note saying, We are
7	filling out the verdict sheet and will be ready at 12:30.
8	You can't imagine what happiness this is. At 12:28 we
9	adjourned a 90-minute criminal conference. So timing is
10	everything, okay?
11	Therefore, I believe, I'm correct in saying you have
12	reached a verdict.
13	THE JURY: Yes, we have.
14	THE COURT: All right.
15	Jeremy, will you please retrieve the verdict sheet
16	from the foreperson of the jury.
17	(Pause)
18	THE COURT: Would you please return that to the
19	foreperson and would you please take the verdict.
20	Will the foreperson please rise.
21	THE LAW CLERK: Beginning with Section 1, Plaintiff
22	Okeke. Under the Age Discrimination and Employment Act,
23	federal law, has Mr. Okeke proved by a preponderance of the
24	evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the
25	basis of his age as to his termination?

1	THE FOREPERSON: No.
2	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
3	THE FOREPERSON: No.
4	THE LAW CLERK: As to overtime opportunities?
5	THE FOREPERSON: No.
6	THE LAW CLERK: Under the New York City Human Rights
7	Law, city law, has Mr. Okeke proved by a preponderance of the
8	evidence that the hospital
9	THE COURT: Slow down. The poor court reporter,
10	Jeremy.
11	THE LAW CLERK: Sorry.
12	By a preponderance of the evidence that the hospital
13	discriminated against him on the basis of his age as to his
14	termination?
15	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
16	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
17	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
18	THE LAW CLERK: Has Mr. Okeke proved by a
19	preponderance of the evidence that he experienced a hostile
20	work environment on account of his age?
21	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
22	THE LAW CLERK: What amount of damages, if any, do you
23	award Mr. Okeke?
24	Back pay?
25	THE FOREPERSON: \$188,000.

1	THE LAW CLERK: As to emotional distress?
2	THE COURT: Front pay.
3	THE LAW CLERK: As to front pay?
4	THE FOREPERSON: No.
5	THE LAW CLERK: As to emotional distress?
6	THE FOREPERSON: \$20,000.
7	THE LAW CLERK: Did the hospital act with malice or
8	reckless indifference to Mr. Okeke's legal rights such that
9	punitive damages are appropriate?
10	THE FOREPERSON: No.
11	THE COURT: I'm going to do this one plaintiff at a
12	time. I assume that you want the jury polled on the verdicts?
13	MR. GERSON: Yes, your Honor.
14	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, harken
15	to your verdict as it stands recorded.
16	You and each of you say as to the Plaintiff Okeke that
17	he has failed to prove by a preponderance of the evidence that
18	the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his age
19	under federal law, that he proved by a preponderance of the
20	evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the
21	basis of his age as to termination, training, and hostile work
22	environment under the law of the City of New York, and you have
23	awarded him back pay damages of \$188,000, the damages for
24	emotional distress of \$20,000, and no punitive damages.
25	Juror No. 1, is that your verdict as to Mr. Okeke?

1	JUROR: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Juror No. 2, is that your verdict?
3	JUROR: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Juror No. 3, is that your verdict?
5	JUROR: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Juror No. 4, is that your verdict?
7	JUROR: Yes.
8	THE COURT: Juror No. 5, is that your verdict?
9	Juror No. 5, is that your verdict?
10	JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Juror No. 6, is that your verdict?
12	JUROR: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Juror No. 7, is that your verdict?
14	JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Juror No. 8, is that your verdict?
16	JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: So say you and so say you all.
18	Let's turn now to the plaintiff
19	MR. GERSON: Your Honor, just to interject, I wouldn't
20	mind if you did this once cumulatively at the end.
21	THE COURT: I'd like to do it separately. This is one
22	of the few times when I actually get to say what's going to
23	happen.
24	As to the plaintiff Jerry Baglione.
25	THE LAW CLERK: As to the plaintiff Jerry Baglione,

1	under the Age Discrimination and Employment Act, has
2	Mr. Baglione proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the
3	hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his age as
4	to his termination?
5	THE FOREPERSON: No.
6	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
7	THE FOREPERSON: No.
8	THE LAW CLERK: As to overtime opportunities?
9	THE FOREPERSON: No.
10	THE LAW CLERK: Under the New York City Human Rights
11	Law, has Mr. Baglione proved by a preponderance of the evidence
12	that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his
13	age as to his termination?
14	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
15	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
16	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
17	THE LAW CLERK: Has Mr. Baglione proved by a
18	preponderance of the evidence that he experienced a hostile
19	work environment on account of his age?
20	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
21	THE LAW CLERK: What amount of damages, if any, do you
22	award to Mr. Baglione?
23	Back pay?
24	THE FOREPERSON: \$123,000.
25	THE LAW CLERK: Front pay?

JUROR:

Yes.

1 THE FOREPERSON: None. THE LAW CLERK: Emotional distress? 2 3 THE FOREPERSON: \$20,000. 4 THE LAW CLERK: Did the hospital act with malice or 5 reckless indifference to Mr. Baglione's legal rights such that 6 punitive damages are appropriate? 7 THE FOREPERSON: No. 8 THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, harken 9 to your verdict as to Mr. Baglione has failed to prove by a 10 preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated 11 him on any basis under federal -- on the basis of his age as to 12 any termination, training, or overtime opportunities under 13 federal law, but did prove by a preponderance of the evidence 14 that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his 15 age as to termination, training, and hostile work environment. And you have awarded him back pay of \$123,000, no front pay, 16 17 emotional distress damages of \$20,000, and no punitive damages. Juror No. 1, is that your verdict? 18 19 JUROR: Yes. 20 THE COURT: Juror No. 2, is that your verdict? 21 JUROR: Yes. 22 THE COURT: Juror No. 3, is that your verdict? 23 JUROR: Yes. 24 THE COURT: Juror No. 4, is that your verdict?

1	THE COURT: Juror No. 5, is that your verdict?
2	JUROR: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Juror No. 6, is that your verdict?
4	JUROR: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Juror No. 7, is that your verdict?
6	JUROR: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Juror No. 8, is that your verdict?
8	JUROR: Yes.
9	THE COURT: So say you and so say you all.
10	Let's move on to the plaintiff Iqbal Bajwa?
11	THE LAW CLERK: As to Plaintiff Bajwa, under the Age
12	Discrimination and Employment Act, has Mr. Bajwa proved by a
13	preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated
14	against him on the basis of his age as to his termination?
15	FOREPERSON: Yes. Oh, I'm sorry. No.
16	THE COURT: As to his termination?
17	FOREPERSON: His termination, no.
18	THE COURT: Thank you.
19	THE LAW CLERK: As to a promotion?
20	THE FOREPERSON: No.
21	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
22	THE FOREPERSON: No.
23	THE LAW CLERK: As to overtime opportunities?
24	THE FOREPERSON: No.
25	THE LAW CLERK: Under the New York City Human Rights

24

25

Law, has Mr. Bajwa proved by a preponderance of the evidence 1 that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his 2 3 age as to his termination? 4 THE FOREPERSON: Yes. THE LAW CLERK: As to a promotion? 5 THE FOREPERSON: Yes. 6 7 THE LAW CLERK: As to training? THE FOREPERSON: Yes. 8 9 THE LAW CLERK: Has Mr. Bajwa proved by a 10 preponderance of the evidence that he experienced a hostile 11 work environment on account of his age? 12 THE FOREPERSON: Uh-oh. 13 THE COURT: This is why do this. I need you all to go 14 back to the jury room and make sure that you've filled out the 15 verdict sheet correctly in accordance with your verdict and 16 you'll come right back out. 17 JUROR: Okay. 18 (Jury excused) 19 (Jury present) 20 THE COURT: I just had a feeling that something like 21 this was going to happen, which is why I want to do them very 22 clearly one-by-one. 23 All right. Let's start again with Mr. Bajwa.

Employment Act, has Mr. Bajwa proved by a preponderance of the

THE LAW CLERK: Under the Age Discrimination and

1	evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the
2	basis of his age as to his termination?
3	THE FOREPERSON: No.
4	THE LAW CLERK: As to a promotion?
5	THE FOREPERSON: No.
6	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
7	THE FOREPERSON: No.
8	THE LAW CLERK: As to overtime opportunities?
9	THE FOREPERSON: No.
10	THE LAW CLERK: Under the New York City Human Rights
11	Law, has Mr. Bajwa proved by a preponderance of the evidence
12	that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his
13	age as to his termination?
14	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
15	THE LAW CLERK: As to a promotion?
16	THE FOREPERSON: No.
17	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
18	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
19	THE LAW CLERK: Has Mr. Bajwa proved by a
20	preponderance of the evidence that he experienced a hostile
21	work environment on account of his age?
22	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
23	THE LAW CLERK: What amount of damages, if any, do you
24	award to Mr. Bajwa?
25	Back pay?

1	THE FOREPERSON: \$196,000.
2	THE LAW CLERK: Front pay?
3	THE FOREPERSON: None.
4	THE LAW CLERK: Emotional distress?
5	THE FOREPERSON: \$20,000.
6	THE LAW CLERK: Did the hospital act with malice or
7	reckless indifference to Mr. Bajwa's legal rights such that
8	punitive damages are appropriate?
9	THE FOREPERSON: No.
10	THE COURT: Harken to your verdict as it stands
11	recorded.
12	You find that plaintiff Iqbal Bajwa has failed to
13	prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the hospital
14	discriminated on any basis, on the basis of his age, under
15	federal law, but that he has proved by a preponderance of the
16	evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the
17	basis of his age as to his termination, training, and hostile
18	work environment, but not as to a promotion.
19	And you further award Mr. Bajwa damages of back pay in
20	the amount of \$196,000, no front pay, \$20,000 in emotional
21	distress damages, and no punitive damages.
22	Juror No. 1, is that your verdict?
23	JUROR: Yes.
24	THE COURT: Juror No. 2, is that your verdict?
25	JUROR: Yes.

1	THE COURT: Juror No. 3, is that your verdict?
2	JUROR: Yes.
3	THE COURT: Juror No. 4, is that your verdict?
4	JUROR: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Juror No. 5, is that your verdict?
6	JUROR: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Juror No. 6, is that your verdict?
8	JUROR: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Juror No. 7, is that your verdict?
10	JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Juror No. 8, is that your verdict?
12	JUROR: Yes.
13	THE COURT: So say you, so say you all.
14	Let's proceed to the plaintiff Adel Mahmoud.
15	THE LAW CLERK: Under the Age Discrimination and
16	Employment Act, has Mr. Mahmoud proved by a preponderance of
17	the evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the
18	basis of his age as to his termination?
19	FOREPERSON: No.
20	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
21	THE FOREPERSON: No.
22	THE LAW CLERK: As to overtime opportunities?
23	THE FOREPERSON: No.
24	THE LAW CLERK: Under the New York City Human Rights
25	Law, has Mr. Mahmoud proved by a preponderance of the evidence

1	that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his
2	age as to his termination?
3	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
4	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
5	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
6	THE LAW CLERK: Has Mr. Mahmoud proved by a
7	preponderance of the evidence that he experienced a hostile
8	work environment on account of his age?
9	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
10	THE LAW CLERK: What amount of damages, if any, do you
11	award to Mr. Mahmoud as to back pay?
12	THE FOREPERSON: \$125,000.
13	THE LAW CLERK: As to front pay?
14	THE FOREPERSON: None.
15	THE LAW CLERK: As to emotional distress?
16	THE FOREPERSON: \$20,000.
17	THE LAW CLERK: Did the hospital act with malice or
18	reckless indifference to Mr. Mahmoud's legal rights such that
19	punitive damages are appropriate?
20	THE FOREPERSON: No.
21	THE COURT: Jurors, harken to your verdict.
22	You find that Mr. Mahmoud has not proved by a
23	preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated
24	against him on the basis of age under federal law as to his
25	termination, training, or overtime opportunities; that he has

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his age as to his termination, training, and hostile work environment; and you award him backpay damages in the amount of \$125,000; front pay, none; and emotional distress damages in the amount of \$20,000, but no punitive damages.

Juror No. 1, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 2, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 3, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 4, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 5, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 6, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 7, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 8, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: So say you and so say you all.

As to plaintiff Naeem Qureshi.

THE LAW CLERK: Under the Age Discrimination and

1	Employment Act, has Mr. Qureshi proved by a preponderance of
2	the evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the
3	basis of his age as to his termination?
4	FOREPERSON: No.
5	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
6	THE FOREPERSON: No.
7	THE LAW CLERK: As to overtime opportunities?
8	THE FOREPERSON: No.
9	THE LAW CLERK: Under the New York City Human Rights
10	Law, has Mr. Qureshi proved by a preponderance of the evidence
11	that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his
12	age as to his termination?
13	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
14	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
15	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
16	THE LAW CLERK: Has Mr. Qureshi proved by a
17	preponderance of the evidence that he experienced a hostile
18	work environment on account of his age?
19	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
20	THE LAW CLERK: What amount of damages, if any, do you
21	award Mr. Qureshi as to back pay?
22	THE FOREPERSON: \$125,000.
23	THE LAW CLERK: As to front pay?
24	THE FOREPERSON: None.
25	THE LAW CLERK: As to emotional distress?

1 | THE FOREPERSON: \$20,000.

THE LAW CLERK: Did the hospital act with malice or reckless indifference to Mr. Qureshi's legal rights such that punitive damages are appropriate?

THE FOREPERSON: No.

THE COURT: Harken to your verdict, ladies and gentlemen of the jury. You find that Mr. Qureshi has not proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated against him as to his termination, training, or overtime opportunities on the basis of his age under federal law, but that he has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his age as to termination, training, and hostile work environment under New York City law. You have awarded back pay in the amount of \$125,000, no front pay, and emotional distress damages of \$20,000, no punitive damages.

Juror No. 1, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 2, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 3, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 4, is that your verdict?

JUROR: Yes.

THE COURT: Juror No. 5, is that your verdict?

1	JUROR: Yes.
2	THE COURT: Juror No. 6, is that your verdict?
3	JUROR: Yes.
4	THE COURT: Juror No. 7, is that your verdict?
5	JUROR: Yes.
6	THE COURT: Juror No. 8, is that your verdict?
7	JUROR: Yes.
8	THE COURT: So say you and so say you all.
9	Finally as to the plaintiff Abel De La Trinidad.
10	THE LAW CLERK: Under the Age Discrimination and
11	Employment Act, has Mr. De La Trinidad proved by a
12	preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated
13	against him on the basis of his age as to his termination?
14	FOREPERSON: No.
15	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
16	THE FOREPERSON: No.
17	THE LAW CLERK: As to overtime opportunities?
18	THE FOREPERSON: No.
19	THE LAW CLERK: Under the New York City Human Rights
20	Law, has Mr. De La Trinidad proved by a preponderance of the
21	evidence that the hospital discriminated against him on the
22	basis of his age as to his termination?
23	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.
24	THE LAW CLERK: As to training?
25	THE FOREPERSON: Yes.

THE LAW CLERK: Has Mr. De La Trinidad proved by a preponderance of the evidence that he experienced a hostile work environment on account of his age?

THE FOREPERSON: Yes.

THE LAW CLERK: What amount of damages, if any, do you award to Mr. De La Trinidad for back pay?

THE FOREPERSON: \$141,000.

THE LAW CLERK: Front pay?

THE FOREPERSON: None.

THE LAW CLERK: Emotional distress?

THE FOREPERSON: \$20,000.

THE LAW CLERK: Did the hospital act with malice or reckless indifference to Mr. De La Trinidad's legal rights such that punitive damages are appropriate?

THE FOREPERSON: No.

THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen of the jury, harken to your verdict as it stands recorded.

You hold that the plaintiff Abel De La Trinidad has not proved by a preponderance of the evidence that the hospital discriminated against him as to his termination, training, or overtime opportunities on the basis of his age under federal law, but that he did prove that the hospital discriminated against him on the basis of his age as to termination, training, and hostile work environment under New York City law. And you have awarded him \$141,000 in back pay, emotional

1	distress damages of \$20,000, no front pay, and no punitive
2	damages.
3	Juror No. 1, is that your verdict?
4	JUROR: Yes.
5	THE COURT: Juror No. 2, is that your verdict?
6	JUROR: Yes.
7	THE COURT: Juror No. 3, is that your verdict?
8	JUROR: Yes.
9	THE COURT: Juror No. 4, is that your verdict?
10	JUROR: Yes.
11	THE COURT: Juror No. 5, is that your verdict?
12	JUROR: Yes.
13	THE COURT: Juror No. 6, is that your verdict?
14	JUROR: Yes.
15	THE COURT: Juror No. 7, is that your verdict?
16	JUROR: Yes.
17	THE COURT: Juror No. 8, is that your verdict?
18	JUROR: Yes.
19	THE COURT: So say you and so say you all.
20	Jeremy, if you'll please recover the verdict sheet.
21	And the foreperson may be seated.
22	Ladies and gentlemen, it's time to say good-bye. And
23	I want to say something that I say at every trial, but at this
24	trial I want to say something special. And I speak not just
25	for myself, but for all of the lawyers in the case.

Everybody hates the concept of jury service. And a lot of people do a lot of things to try to get out of jury service. And when they have an opportunity to get off a jury, almost everybody takes advantage of that opportunity.

In this extraordinary case, the parties decided to seat Juror No. 4 knowing that she had a hard-and-fast deadline to leave. And we all understood that if there was no verdict by that time, which was the end of last week, that we would just have to say good-bye to Juror No. 4.

It was unimaginable to me last Thursday afternoon when we asked Juror No. 4 to stay that what would happen happened.

That she would say that she had cleared her schedule so that she could deliberate with you.

Ma'am, I don't know how to thank you, but I have to tell you, I commend you for your citizenship and for your devotion. I love juries. I've loved juries for my whole career, but especially because over 20 years ago now I headed a commission that makes an informed state jury service. And I talked to a lot of jurors all around the state, I got to know a lot of people who have been on juries, and it's given me kind of a special thing for juries. They never cease to surprise me with their devotion. But this really, really was commented on by all of us. And I want it on the record and I want you to know how grateful we are to you for having stuck with it.

Thank you.

Applause to you all.

What I usually say at the end of the case is there was a very famous judge who sat on this Court for 35 years and who was one of the great judges of the United States District Courts, recognized nationwide, and way up to the Supreme Court level, for his brilliance. His name was Edward Weinfeld.

Really an extraordinary judge.

Those of us who sit on the Court who remember Judge Weinfeld -- I'm one of those people; I had the experience of appearing before him -- try to imitate him in many things because he was just -- in his brilliance and his demeanor and his dedication to the job, he was the embodiment of what a federal court judge should be. There's only one thing I won't mimic of Judge Weinfeld's, and that is at the end of the case he would look at the jurors -- he was famous for this -- he would say, I suppose you expect to be thanked. You will wait in vain for thanks from me because you, like I, must take your satisfaction from the knowledge that you have done your duty to the best of your ability.

I don't feel that way for precisely the reason that I gave. There's so many people who will do anything to get off jury service: Answer questions strangely, who will throw summonses in the waste basket, who just won't step up to the plate and do one of the only two things that our country ordinarily asks us to do, pay taxes and serve on a jury.

And we can continue to function as a nation in significant part because people like you are willing to take what's turned out to be two and-a-half weeks out of your very busy lives to sit here and listen to dispute among people that you've never met before, you're never going to meet again, that you have no personal interest in, and you think about it, you parse it, and you resolve it. It is an extraordinary function that you perform; it's an extraordinary role that you play.

So I do thank you. And I thank you on behalf of my whole staff and the lawyers for the parties and the parties and all of us here in the Southern District of New York. I thank you very much for having served on this jury.

You are excused.

If you'll give me five minutes with the lawyers, I'd like to come back and shake hands with you before we go. Okay?

Thank you.

(Jury discharged)

THE COURT: Okay. What can I expect?

MR. GERSON: For me to think about it.

THE COURT: Okay. How many days do you have? Ten?

MR. GERSON: Ten.

THE COURT: Right. Good.

Because if you're going to make a motion, I want

Jeremy to be here to decide it. And Jeremy will not be with me

forever.

1	MR. GERSON: Well, we wish him well wherever he is.
2	THE COURT: He's there in his accustomed seat.
3	So I'm not going to extend the ten days, all right?
4	MR. GERSON: I have no problem with that.
5	THE COURT: I understand. I understand that you need
6	to consult
7	MR. GERSON: I tend not to shoot from the hip.
8	THE COURT: No, no, you need to consult with your
9	client.
10	You'll have an attorneys' fees motion?
11	MR. OFODILE: Yes, your Honor. I don't know when the
12	Court will be entering judgment.
13	THE COURT: Well, first of all, I have to see if there
14	are going to be any post-verdict motions. I'd like from you an
15	attorneys' fees motion, which I'd appreciate if you would file
16	within ten days. You'll be allowed to amend it if there is a
17	post-verdict motion, okay?
18	MR. OFODILE: Within ten days from the day of entering
19	of judgment that my time starts to run or time to file the
20	motion starts to run. The reason I'm asking is that I'm going
21	on vacation on Saturday and I will be away for nine days.
22	THE COURT: Okay. Go on vacation.
23	MR. OFODILE: Yes, Judge.
24	THE COURT: All right.
25	Gentlemen, the jury has spoken. May you take

H7PVOKET satisfaction in what the jury said. Okay. Thank you, all. MR. GERSON: Thank you, your Honor. (Trial concluded)